

August 1, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 9939

Most of our cities face rising costs of traditional services and growing demands for new services. Daily our news media remind us of the problems confronting city governments—problems, indeed, confronting the entire Nation. The majority of Americans living in urban areas witness the needs in their daily lives. Without greater Federal assistance, our cities must resort to sharp increases in property and other taxes and in borrowing or allow their services to decline, hastening the decay that already characterizes too many of our urban areas.

Under my proposal, 2 percent of Federal corporate and individual income taxes would be earmarked for automatic distribution to all incorporated cities with populations of 10,000 or more. The Federal moneys would be apportioned among the cities on a strict per capita basis. Each recipient government would use its share in any way it deems advisable; there would be no strings attached.

According to census figures some 1,999 cities would be eligible, involving nearly half the American population: more than 97 million people. Had the program been in effect during the 1966 fiscal year, slightly more than \$2 billion would have been earmarked for distribution. Each city would have received approximately \$20 for each of its residents.

There are two cardinal virtues in this approach to aiding our cities. On the one hand, the needed revenues are generated through the Federal tax system which is more equitable and efficient than local tax systems. On the other hand, decisions affecting use of the funds are left to the local governments which have major and immediate responsibilities in providing the public services.

The superiority of the Federal tax system over local systems is widely recognized. Federal income taxes are more progressive, more efficiently collected, and more responsive to general economic changes than are local property and sales taxes.

Property taxes, on which city governments rely most heavily for revenue, are largely unrelated to an individual's ability to pay; they are often regressive. Property taxes do not automatically generate more revenue in proportion to economic growth; yet economic growth almost invariably requires expansion of city services. Consequently, property tax rates must be raised even though the property may be depreciating in value. Federal income taxes, on the other hand, automatically generate revenues in proportion to economic growth without resort to legislative action to change the statutory rates. When property tax rates are raised, serious administrative difficulties generally follow and add to the cost of collection. Tax delinquencies increase as do appeals of assessment. Hence much administrative effort and expense goes into tracking down the delinquencies and in adjudicating the appeals.

Another significant deterrent to raising local taxes is the danger that higher taxes will drive off potential or existing residents and businesses which can locate themselves in other cities or suburbs where rates are lower. The loss of im-

portant business and individual taxpayers may well offset any gains from higher taxes. Thus, competition among cities and other taxing jurisdictions often prevents local governments from raising revenue much needed to meet the problems of our cities.

It is my hope that one day we will move to a uniform, progressive tax system in this country that will eliminate the multiple jurisdictions now levying varying amounts of taxes. The present setup necessarily hampers businesses operating across jurisdictional boundaries and necessarily affects individuals on an unequal basis.

This maze of tax systems is costly, inefficient, and inequitable. Federal revenue sharing is a major step in the needed transformation. With it must come reform of the Federal tax structure. I await with great interest the reform proposals that the President is expected to place before the Congress by the end of this year. We must assure that the system operates, fairly, and efficiently.

Our cities have increasingly turned to the Federal Government for help. The Federal response has come largely in the form of grant-in-aid programs directed at specific problems and accompanied by Federal requirements and controls. Many of these programs may need reform or redirection, but the purpose of my revenue-sharing plan is to supplement, not supplant, existing efforts.

Revenue sharing will give new flexibility to city governments. It will aid them in filling the gaps between present grant programs. It will permit them to be more responsive to the wishes of the people they represent.

It is imperative that this country upgrade local government. It is necessary both for the mastery of urban problems and for the health of democracy. Much of the frustration of the American people derives from a feeling of inability to influence the decisions that affect their lives. We must at every turn alter the mechanisms of government in order to expand opportunities for citizen participation. We must leave maximum decisionmaking at the local level. To be sure, this will require reform and reorganization of many local governments. I am confident that the urge to participate, exhibited by so many Americans today, will bring the desired changes. Revenue sharing can help make these changes meaningful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3966) to assist the cities of the United States to meet their needs for increased revenues by sharing with them a portion of the revenues derived from the Federal income tax, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE STATUS OF REFUGEES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from executive K, 90th Congress, second session, a protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, which was endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1966, and soon thereafter opened for accession by the Secretary General. I ask that the protocol, together with the message from the President, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished majority leader explain the procedure involved?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. This is the ordinary procedure by means of which a protocol is forwarded by the President. Under the Constitution that is his responsibility. It is forwarded with a message which goes to the Senate. Then the protocol and the message is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations because it comes within that area.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The unanimous-consent request is that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations in order to be printed and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, which was endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1966 and soon thereafter opened for accession by the Secretary General. Annexed is the text of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, to which the Protocol relates.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Protocol constitutes a comprehensive Bill of Rights for refugees fleeing their country because of persecution on account of their political views, race, religion, nationality, or social ties. Foremost among the rights provided in this humanitarian instrument is the prohibition against expulsion or return of refugees to any country in which they would face persecution. Through a number of other specific guarantees, refugees are to be accorded rights which—taken together—would enable them to cease being refugees, and instead to become self-supporting members of free societies, living under conditions of dignity and self respect.

It is decidedly in the interest of the United States to promote this United Nations effort to broaden the extension of asylum and status for those fleeing persecution. Given the American heritage of concern for the homeless and persecuted, and our traditional role of

leadership in promoting assistance for refugees, accession by the United States to the Protocol would lend conspicuous support to the effort of the United Nations toward attaining the Protocol's objectives everywhere. This impetus would be enhanced by the fact that most refugees in this country already enjoy the protection and rights which the Protocol seeks to secure for refugees in all countries. Thus, United States accession should help advance acceptance of the Protocol and observance of its humane standards by States in which, presently, guarantees and practices relating to protection and other rights for refugees are less liberal than in our own country.

Accession to the Protocol would not impinge adversely upon established practices under existing laws in the United States. State laws are not superseded by the Convention or Protocol. In two instances where divergences between the Convention and United States laws would cause difficulty, appropriate reservations are recommended.

Refugee problems—in their origin and in their resolution—cannot be divorced from the strife, tensions and oppression which are so detrimental to the well-being of nations and peoples. Once refugees secure asylum, it is essential on humanitarian grounds alone that they be assisted. But emergency assistance—in the absence of rights such as those provided in the Protocol—can degenerate into permanent relief, fostering the refugees' human deterioration and permitting abandonment of responsibility by concerned governments. On the other hand, the provision of such rights can lead to just and lasting solutions to refugee problems. Such solutions in turn can help promote the reduction of tensions, the solution of broader issues and the stability of concerned nations.

United States accession to the Protocol would thus constitute a significant and symbolic element in our ceaseless effort to promote everywhere the freedom and dignity of the individual and of nations; and to secure and preserve peace in the world.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol and give its advice and consent to accession, subject to two reservations, as recommended in the report of the Secretary of State.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1968.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 1, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

3.1166. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipelines, and for other purposes; and

3.2060. An act to amend section 503(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend for a period for five years the authorization to make appropriations for allocations and grants for the collection and publication of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 926

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 17324) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO CERTAIN COSTS INCURRED IN PLANTING AND DEVELOPING CITRUS GROVES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 927

Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. TOWER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3864) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the capitalization of certain costs incurred in planting and developing citrus groves, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

AMENDMENT NO. 928

Mr. SPONG submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 18037), an act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes:

On page 16, line 5, before the period insert a colon and the following: "And provided further, That the \$90,965,000 provided for 'School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas' in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1968, shall be available for expenditure until September 30, 1968."

Mr. SPONG also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the House bill 18037, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. President, in that lush period directly following World War II the United States was at the pinnacle of world power. The U.S. dollar was in demand throughout the world. Our gold stockpile was tremendous. The United States was held in the highest admiration in capitals the world over. That is gone with the wind. Now the U.S. dollar is under attack throughout Eu-

rope. It has been under severe attack in France during the past 6 months.

That has lagged somewhat, because De Gaulle is having plenty of troubles of his own.

Our gold supply has been depleted. More than half is gone. Except for our satellite country, South Korea, the United States does not have one real friend in Asia. This includes India, where we have saved millions from starvation through our food-for-peace program. Officials of the Government of India are hostile to us and join with the chorus of other Asiatic nations that Yankee aggression in Vietnam has succeeded French colonial aggression in Southeast Asia.

U.S. gold reserves in 1949 approximated \$25 billion; now, less than \$11 billion. In 1949 foreign claims against our gold approximated \$6 billion. On May 1, foreign claims against U.S. gold were nearly six times that at \$34 billion. We lack the friendship, even the respect, of heads of state the world over. We need customers for the products of American farms and factories, and to buy handicraft, furs, and so forth from abroad. Trade is likely to lead to friendship and peace. All our allies, including Canada, are enjoying lucrative trade with Communist countries—China, the Soviet Union, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and others.

Very definitely, we Americans should sell to countries behind the Iron Curtain all products of the United States that the people of those countries can eat, drink, smoke or wear, eliminating, of course, strategic materials.

Our trade with the Soviet Union last year amounted to 1.3 percent of our total exports overseas. The only time our exports behind the Iron Curtain to countries such as the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Poland have exceeded 1 percent was in 1964 when we made large wheat shipments to the Soviet Union which, incidentally, were fully paid for in gold. We should welcome buying furs and handicraft from the Soviet Union and other countries and sell to those countries the products of American farms and factories. People do not fight with their customers, as a rule.

The fact is that the Soviet Union maintains extensive trade with our allies. Australia and Canada have sold hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union and have been paid in gold at the world price. In 1966, the Canadians exported more than \$52 million in food products alone to the Soviet Union, and more than \$110 million in 1967. On the basis of such trade, in recent years, the credit rating of the United Union is definitely very good.

Trade between Eastern and Western Europe is surging ahead by almost 20 percent a year. Witness the following dramatic increases in Western European exports to Eastern Europe from 1961 to 1966: France—\$240 to \$387 million; Italy—\$216 to \$357 million; England—\$295 to \$410 million; West Germany—\$473 to \$696 million; Spain—\$15 to \$57 million; Switzerland—\$66 to \$112 million. During this period U.S. exports to Eastern Europe increased from \$135 million to only \$198 million.

August 1, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 9941

West European industrialists have established a strong foothold in the fastest growing market in the world for industrial goods—those 350 million people who live under Communist rule from Prague, to Vladivostok. West European firms have built or are building approximately 150 factories throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and more contracts are on the way. Italy's Fiat Co. concluded an \$890 million agreement to build a plant in the Soviet Union to produce 730,000 cars a year.

While members of the European Common Market have abolished import restrictions on Eastern European products, we still maintain trade barriers which discriminate against American businessmen, farmers, and working men and women.

Just recently, Mr. President, airline schedules have been instituted between this country and the Soviet Union, with direct jet flights from the Soviet Union to the United States and from the United States to the Soviet Union. This is a step in the right direction.

Of course, we should encourage trade with the various nationalist Communist countries of Europe, which are usually—and often erroneously—referred to as “behind the Iron Curtain.” Countries such as Yugoslavia very definitely are not Soviet satellites, and now it is becoming more evident each day that Czechoslovakia will join the others in no longer viewing itself as a Soviet satellite, and Soviet troops will no longer be within its borders. Czechoslovakia has become another nationalist Communist country, definitely outside the Iron Curtain as far as being a Soviet satellite is concerned. This offers opportunities for a very lucrative trade, such as we are beginning to have with Yugoslavia and other such nations.

Increased trade with the West has forced many Communist governments to institute sweeping economic reforms in order to make their products more competitive in both price and quality. Increased trade from America with European Communist nations will also provide a powerful political tool to woo them toward peace, complete independence of Russia, and consumer orientation.

Also, why continue to ignore the existence of Communist China with its population of 700 million? During 1966 and 1967 alone the Chinese paid more than \$250 million in gold for almost 150 million bushels of wheat exported to them by Canada. West Germany, England, France, Japan, and Australia, to mention a few of our allies, maintain lucrative trade with Communist China. Communist China is torn by internal dissension and threatened by Soviet aggression along the 6,500-mile border between Russia and China. Its development of intercontinental missiles and production of nuclear weapons has been set back 8 years by the internal conflict going on within its borders. Even the most hawkish American no longer talks of Chinese Communists overrunning Southeast Asia.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 minutes to respond to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. I compliment my friend from Ohio for his penetrating analysis of the situation as it is, very much as the young people of today insist that we “tell it as it is,” and I think in this case it is long overdue that we do so.

There is not a Member of this body who would not stand up and protest the shipment of strategic goods that could be utilized by any of the Communist countries to increase the hardships that are being confronted by our young men around the world, particularly in Vietnam, but last Thanksgiving I had the opportunity, for the first time, to spend any length of time behind the Iron Curtain, in a visit I made to Poland. I shall remember as long as I live an interview that I had with the No. 1 leader of the Catholic Church in Poland, Cardinal Wyszynski. Cardinal Wyszynski is the leading voice of dissent against the regime in Poland.

He suggested that the people of Poland are looking to the United States of America as the one last hope that they have of someday being able to throw off the yoke of totalitarianism which has been clamped on them.

We sense a restlessness among the people over there. You can sense it by talking with student leaders, businessmen, and people from all walks of life. I think one of the important aspects of the Senator's suggestion about opening the doors of nonstrategic trade opportunity is that to do otherwise, to shut the door, would be to say to the restless people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other parts of the Communist world, “We are deserting you; we are turning our backs on you.”

So I think it is important for those well-meaning opponents of this effort, who at the same time speak out and champion every effort to defeat communism, to recognize that the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio is indeed a valuable tool to accomplish that goal, and I salute him for this effort.

Mr. President, I now ask to be recognized in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a fact which I regret very much; namely, that in recent months the National Guard has been subjected to considerable adverse, as well as undeserved criticism and publicity. Those attacking the Guard often have been guilty of disseminating erroneous impressions and even misinformation about its strength, vitality, and operations. It seems to me that it is time that attention be called to the excellent record achieved and the invaluable services performed by the officers and members of this historic American organization.

I have had the opportunity, Mr. President, to attend the National Guard camp that every summer is operated and participated in by our Indiana Guardsmen. Right now, some of them are in Grayling, Mich., undergoing active duty training. It is rigorous. I have had the

chance to observe them, and thus can speak with some firsthand information about the esprit de corps, the degree of training, and, indeed, the accomplishments of these young men, not only from Indiana, but from all across this country, who are serving in the National Guard today.

There is no question but that the National Guard today is an integral part of the Nation's first line of defense. Evidence indicates that it has become the strongest, best equipped, and most potent peacetime Ready Reserve Force in our history. In every State, in Puerto Rico, and in the District of Columbia, members and units of the National Guard are constantly being trained for rapid mobilization and effective utilizations as a powerful fighting force whenever and wherever needed.

The National Guard, which currently has a strength of approximately 500,000 officers and men, has reached the highest degree of peacetime mobilization readiness in its 300-year-plus history. The Guard trains under Regular U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force standards. With the modern equipment available today it is sufficiently versatile to meet effectively almost any situation which might arise.

Guardsmen have fought for the freedom of this country in every major conflict since the Revolutionary War except Vietnam. The value of the National Guard contribution to our fighting strength in World War I is evidenced by the fact that 17 Guard divisions served overseas. It is interesting to note that of the eight American divisions rated excellent or superior by the German Supreme Command, six were National Guard divisions.

The Guard's performance in World War II was well summarized in a statement made by the late Robert P. Patterson, then Secretary of War:

The National Guard took to the field 18 Infantry Divisions—300,000 men. Those State troops doubled the strength of the Army at once, and their presence in the field gave the country a sense that it had pressed the lowest ebb of its weakness.

Nine of these Divisions crossed the Atlantic to Europe and Africa, and nine went to the far reaches of the Pacific.

The soldiers of the Guard fought in every action in which the Army participated from Bataan to Okinawa. They made a brilliant record on every fighting front. They proved once more the value of the trained citizen-soldier.

All Army National Guardsmen train a minimum of 48 weekly armory training periods and 15 days full-time field training each year. The Department of Defense, in order to further increase combat-readiness, has designated Selected Reserve Force units whose members are required to perform an additional 24 training periods annually.

Personnel of these units often devote many hours over and above the minimum requirements, in many cases at personal sacrifice to themselves and their families, in order to be combat-ready to serve where needed.

Members of the Guard have been criticized in some quarters for being draft dodgers, strikebreakers, Boy Scouts, rag-tag soldiers, and even as trigger-happy and scared boys during riot control duty.

Even though Department of Defense strategic planning has not required mobilization of most of these reserve units for Vietnam duty, their very existence plays an important role in the defense of the country. The Guard has consistently and constantly sought to be among the first to be called into combat, and Congress recognized this when it adopted the following provision:

It is the intent of Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the National security in excess of those of the regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, the National Guard of the United States, or such parts thereof as may be necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered into the active military service of the United States and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

Perhaps it would not be inappropriate to remind ourselves of the unique National-State status of the National Guard. The framers of the Constitution wisely foresaw that States and communities might have need for trained, disciplined, military personnel. They made provision for a system of forces which, although primarily organized and operated by the States, could be called into national service during time of need. Not the least important power delegated to Congress by article I, section 8, was that of invoking this authority as follows:

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

The National Guard in each State is normally under command of the Governor, available immediately in event of disaster or local emergency. This responsiveness to State, as well as National needs does much to tell the story of the Guard. It is the last remaining State law enforcement force available to the Governor after all other State and local agencies have been employed.

To become a member of the National Guard of the United States, the individual must first enlist or be appointed as an officer in the Army or Air National Guard of one of the States. At the time of enlistment or appointment in the National Guard of a State, the individual is also enlisted as a reservist of the U.S. Army or U.S. Air Force, or, in the case of an officer, appointed by the Secretary of the Army or Air Force as a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force. He thus becomes a member of the National Guard of the United States.

Each individual, therefore, has at all times a dual status. He trains in his State status as a member of the National Guard. When a national emergency is declared and his unit is ordered into active Federal service, he serves as a member of the National Guard of the United States. When relieved from active duty in Federal service, the individual or unit reverts to former status as a part of the National Guard of the State and command passes back to the Governor.

It should be kept in mind that the National Guardsman, whether an officer or enlisted man, must meet the same physical and mental standards for appointment and promotion as a member of the U.S. Army Reserve, since the guardsman is, in his dual status, a reservist as well. These standards are as high and, in some cases, higher, than those set for the active service. It is also important to note that since October 1957 every Army National Guard recruit without prior military service has been required, as a condition of his voluntary enlistment, to take 6 months active duty in basic and technical training at Army training centers. Guardsmen attend Army service schools at all levels, including the Army War College, on an equal basis with their Active Army contemporaries. Records bear out the fact that guardsmen do exceptionally well in these courses. Successful completion of these same courses at an appropriate level is a prerequisite for the promotion of National Guard officers and is not subject to waiver.

Thus, the National Guard provides the Governor a force ready to meet natural emergencies, such as fire, floods, snowstorms, and maintenance of the law, in addition to providing the Nation with a ready reserve force to supplement the Regular Army and Air Force.

In this dual role function, the Guard is often unwittingly subjected to disparaging remarks from those unfamiliar with the nature and character of missions assigned it. Mr. President, from personal observation and from reports to me by responsible officials, I can report that the Indiana National Guardsman has been of tremendous assistance to the victims of tornadoes, floods, and other disasters in my State. Several times every year, Indiana guardsmen respond to calls for assistance. They have fought forest fires, dug through snowdrifts, searched for fugitives and lost children, snatched victims from floodwaters, and restored order in communities torn by violence.

During 1966 alone, Indiana guardsmen were called out on nine separate occasions to assist local authorities. The length of duty varied from 1 to 4 days and involved a variety of missions. During a recent critical period of concern over the likelihood of civil disturbance, a minimum of 1,000 troops were ordered into training in the immediate area involved, and an additional 5,400 troops were placed on a standby alert poised for action should the occasion have demanded. Although actual commitment of troops to quell the threatened disturbance was not required, it is believed that the prompt response to duty and the movement of troops and equipment in the disturbed area acted as a deterrent to what otherwise might have developed into a catastrophe of major proportions.

In sum, Mr. President, it seems to me that the National Guard has played an honorable and vital role in our history.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Salute to Guardsmen," recently published in the Indianapolis News, which expressed the high esteem in which the National Guard is held by many of the people of my State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SALUTE TO GUARDSMEN

In the aftermath of rioting and civil disorder a lot of people seem to be knocking the country's National Guardsmen—civilian weekend warriors—who are called to our defense when the going gets rough.

Commentators and government officials have called for more riot-control training. Some have said guardsmen don't get such training. These assertions are mistaken, as are those which say the guardsmen don't know how to fight snipers. They fought back with fire and if anyone knows a better way he should say so.

Some have said the guardsmen, youths in their late teens and early 20s, were "scared" when they went into the riot area. Is there any combat soldier who isn't a little scared as he goes into battle?

This country is in sad shape when its young men in National Guard uniforms are criticized for taking prompt and immediate action in riots as ordered by civilian authority.

National guardsmen are the ones the snipers are shooting at when they are called from their civilian pursuits to re-establish law and order. In like fashion, guardsmen fought for the freedom of this country in the Revolutionary War and have fought in every war since except Vietnam.

It is time to stop second-guessing and to salute the Guard for its outstanding service to the nation.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Pipeline: The Army in Training," written by Sfc. Victor Mulero and Pfc. Mark Cox, and published in the Army Times of April 17, 1968.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PIPELINE: THE ARMY IN TRAINING—GUARDSMEN "CONQUER" CANAL ZONE JUNGLES

(By Sfc. Victor Mulero and Pfc. Mark Cox)

FORT SHERMAN, C.Z.—The dense, murky jungles of the Canal Zone seem impenetrable and foreboding at 6 a.m. Trees, bushes, ferns, and vines fight for a square inch of earth in which to sink their roots in the already thick undergrowth. Insects, snakes, bats, and animals of all descriptions live and thrive in the sweaty ever-dark dampness. With the exception of the narrow gravel road leading down to the Fort San Lorenzo boat landing, the only open space where the rising sun's rays can penetrate is the wide expanse of the Chagres River.

Suddenly, the jungle stillness is broken as men in the wet muddy fatigues and full battle gear emerge from a previously unseen jungle trail, and begin to form into platoons on the narrow road. The Indiana National Guard's 201-man contingent is about to begin another day of jungle training in the Army School of the Americas' jungle operations committee's 55-square-mile patch of green hell, near Fort Sherman.

But these Guardsmen are not Vietnam-bound as are most of the 10,000 U.S. soldiers who pass through the backbreaking two-week jungle survival course here annually. They are preparing for any emergency which might call them to carry out their mission, reinforcing the CZ's defenses.

The jungle operations course teaches the soldier-student how to use the jungle as an ally rather than fear it as a dangerous enemy. By learning how to use the undergrowth as cover, the leaves and trees as shelters, and the animals, insects, and plants as food, the soldier comes to understand how to make the impenetrable penetrable and the seemingly hostile a friend.